



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,593	05/08/2006	Philip Thonhauser	085523-0381114	1729
909	7590	08/02/2011	EXAMINER	
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP			DEO, DUY VU NGUYEN	
P.O. BOX 10500				
MCLEAN, VA 22102				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1713	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/02/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket_ip@pillsburylaw.com
margaret.drosos@pillsburylaw.com

DETAILED ACTION

Allowable Subject Matter

1. Applicant's arguments see amendment and arguments, filed 5/18/11, with respect to claims 1-15, 18-45 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of these claims has been withdrawn.

2. Request for Interference Premature; Examination Not Completed

3. The request for interference filed 5/18/11 is acknowledged. However, examination of this application has not been completed as required by 37 CFR 41.102(a). Consideration of a potential interference is premature. See MPEP § 2303.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 46-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

6. Referring to claim 1 (or new claim 46), it is not clear if commercial, and industrial plants or plants components would be equivalent to an installation. Applicant citing of claims 9 and 16 in page 14 to show that they describe the limitation of testing the result

Art Unit: 1713

of the cleaning for compliance with a previously determined final cleaning result by using an indicator agent on the basis of permanganate in an alkaline environment is found insufficient. Claims 9 and 16 appears at best describing a possible use of the cleaning agent. However, there is no teaching of an active step of testing the result of the cleaning for compliance with a previously determined final cleaning result nor using an indicator agent on the basis of permanganate. Furthermore, paragraphs 0053, 0061, 0064 doesn't describe the step of introducing the indicator agent that is used as an indicator into the alkaline cleaning solution for further use as a cleaning agent after the testing step.

7. Referring to claim 4 (or new claim 49), it is not clear in paragraph 0061 describes introducing the indicator agent into the installation after the last cleaning step. There is no discussion of the step sequence being performed as well as it is not clear if the tank would be the installation.

8. Referring to claim 5 (or new claim 50), there is no teaching of an active step of introducing the indicator agent into the installation before a sterilization step. As described above, there is no discussion of the step sequence being performed as claimed.

9. Referring to claim 6 (or new claim 51), applicant cites the support that is from the patent 7,867,339. It is not clear how this would show that the claim is supported by the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 1713

10. Referring to claim 7 (or new claim 52), paragraphs 0004, 0036, 0054, claims 9, 10, 12, and 14 do not shows a first and second color value detector and the position of the first and second value detector.

11. Referring to claim 9 (or new claim 54), paragraph 0059 describes mixing the ingredients before beginning circulation or cleaning process. However, it doesn't show before the testing of the cleaning result, locating the indicator agent inside a storage tank.

12. Claims 55-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

13. The limitation of the agent is configured to monitor cleanliness by changing color in these claims is vague because it is a mental step. This limitation does not show an active positive step of a method. It is not clear what being done in this limitation and how it would contribute to a step of cleaning an installation.

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 1713

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DUY-VU DEO whose telephone number is (571)272-1462. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton can be reached on 571-272-1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Duy-Vu N Deo/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792

Application/Control Number: 10/578,593

Page 6

Art Unit: 1713

7/27/11